

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 were pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-5, 10, and 13-23 were previously cancelled. Claims 6-9, 11-12, 24-26, 33-37, and 44-45 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 27-32, 38-43 and 46 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 27 and 41 were amended. Accordingly, claims 27-32, 38-43 and 46 remain at issue. Applicants reserve the right to include the withdrawn claims in the present application should a linking claim, such as independent claims 27 and 41 be allowed.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims And
35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 27, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being purportedly anticipated by *Nakagawa* (U.S. Publication No. 20050168662). Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa* in view of *Kikkawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,032). Claims 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa* in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 20020018162). Claims 30, 32, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and *Nishida et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,168). Claims 38, 39, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 27 and 41 were amended to recite that the optical compensation layers are made of an inorganic material that is cut out so that the direction of inclination of the optical axis is substantially equal to the rubbing direction of the liquid crystal panel. This feature

of the invention is described in the specification and figures. (See, e.g., page 13, lines 8-14, Figs. 10-11.)

Nakagawa is directed to a liquid crystal projector to display an image on a liquid crystal device. In *Nakagawa*, a retardation compensator 40R compensates the retardation caused by the birefringence effect of the liquid crystal molecules in the liquid crystal device 41R. (page 5, ¶ 65.) *Nakagawa* discloses that when the reflective liquid display device is located at an off-axis position (the position where the incidence optical axis and the emanation optical axis are different), the retardation compensator 46 may be parallel to the liquid crystal device 45. (page 5-6, ¶ 65; Fig. 6A.)

Unlike claim 27 and 41, *Nakagawa* does not disclose that the optical compensation layers are made of an inorganic material that is cut out so that the direction of inclination of the optical axis is substantially equal to the rubbing direction of the liquid crystal panel. Additionally, there is nothing in *Nakagawa* that suggests that the optical compensation layers are cut out so that the direction of inclination of the optical axis is substantially equal to the rubbing direction of the liquid crystal panel. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Nakagawa* fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 27 and 41, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 28-32, 38-40, 42-43 and 46 depend directly or indirectly from claims 27 or 41 and, thus, should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 27 and 41.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 1, 2007

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger, Reg. No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000